

THE EXAMINER

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOLUME III.

LOUISVILLE KY.: SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1849.

WHOLE NUMBER 104.

THE EXAMINER:
Published Weekly, at Jefferson St., next door but one
to the Post Office.

TERMS:
Two Dollars per Annum, in Advance.
Six Copies for Ten Dollars.
PAUL SEYMOUR,
Proprietor.

REVIEW
Of a Lecture on the North and the South, de-
livered in Cincinnati, January 16, 1849, by
Edmund Fisher.

[CONTINUED.]
Again, we object to making Maryland a standard of the wealth produced by slave-
holding and slave labor. The upper half
of the State, and by far the richest and
most flourishing, is a country of free labor.
The remainder of Maryland slaves is found
chiefly about the tide-waters, where ex-
tension, and languor mark the imper-
fectness produced by slave labor. We
mentioned before that Baltimore, which
contains a large portion of the wealth of
Maryland, is nourished chiefly by the free
labor of its own citizens and the country
about it.

For these reasons we wholly reject Mr.
Fisher's comparison between Massachu-
setts and Maryland. Nothing could be
inferred from it, respecting the comparative
productiveness of free and slave labor,
even if his calculation were correct. To
know how fallacious his results are, let us
suppose that the whole wealth of Massachu-
setts is only double the assessed prop-
erty of Boston and Salem, which contain
a little more than one-sixth of the whole
population of the State. This would
make \$344,000,000, divided among
37,000 inhabitants, gives the average sum
of \$466 to each. The assessed property
of Maryland (including more than 80,000
slaves) amounts to \$202,000,000, which
divided among the 409,000 inhabitants,
gives \$493 to each inhabitant of the State;
which certainly proves nothing in favor of
slavery. If only the slave-holding portion
of Maryland, in the lower and Eastern
half of the State, had been included in the
assessment, the result would have been far
more on the side of slavery. Like Mr.
Fisher, we have taken the population of
both States from the returns of the last
census.

Next comes New York and Vir-
ginia. Here we find, again, his characteris-
tic looseness and inaccuracy of statement.
He gravely tells us that New York and
Virginia "are not materially different" in
extent of territory, when he knew, or
ought to have known, that Virginia is
larger than New York by 20,000 square
miles—which any man of common sense
would call a "material difference" in the
size of two States.

By a singular process, he makes the free
people of Virginia about three times as rich
as the people of New York. As a speci-
men of Mr. Fisher's statistical legendom,
we will quote his own words:
"Her (Virginia's) free population in 1840,
according to the census, was 790,810, and
her property in 1840 was \$600,000,000."
The population of New York, in 1840,
was 2,425,921, and her property is assessed
at \$632,699,993. The average property
of a free person in Virginia is \$759; in
New York it is only \$250, or a little more
than one-third.

This is Mr. Fisher's method of coming
to the average wealth of the people of two
States. Such a tissue of statistical sophis-
try and absurdity we have never before
met.

Let us analyze his borrowed estimate of
property in Virginia. It is Prof. Dew's
figure and extravagant estimate, 15 years
ago, when an expanded currency had
raised prices in general to an enormous
height, and when the cotton mania in the
South-west had raised the prices of slaves
very enormously. Virginia had then
about 170,000 slaves, and the false esti-
mate of their value was prodigious.

This extraordinary swell of prices—this
inflated value of the bellows that blew up
the value of slaves—gave Prof. Dew a
great opportunity of magnifying what he
considered as one of the greatest social
evils of the age, to-wit—slavery, by which
we are always to understand, the slavery of
the black man, for white slavery is an abomi-
nation worse than death, and like free-soil-
ism, "to be resisted at all hazards."

Now we know that since this period of
inflated prices, the money valuation of prop-
erty in Virginia has greatly declined; and
not only all land East of the Alleghany
Mountains and slaves everywhere have
fallen in about half their former prices.
In East Virginia lands generally have lost
not only in cash value, but in real value,
from continued exhaustion of their original
fertility. The same effect has taken place
to some, but a less extent, in the Valley
and some parts West of the Alleghany.
It would be difficult now to make out a
reasonable cash valuation of the property
in Virginia that would amount to \$250,
\$300,000; and much, very much of the
property included in such a valuation is
unproductive, yielding at present no profit
to the owners. More than half the land
is absolutely waste and unproductive, and
is valued, not for what it produces, but for
what it may produce at some time indefi-
nitely future. The far greater part of the
remaining half is so little productive of pre-
sent benefit to the owners, that its valuation
is a speculative estimate, and the population
of the country should be valued as it is
actually directed. The State contains
about 1,000,000 of acres, according to the last
census was 318,771, of whom a large
portion were gentlemen slaveholders and
free men, who "will not," and many of
the working classes were negro women of
little efficiency. If we suppose that they
could make even 25 acres productive, this
would leave upwards of 32,000,000 of
acres in an unproductive state. The
4,000,000 of acres in a productive state.

Note by Mr. Fisher:
"The property of Virginia was computed
in the census now assumed, in 1840, by
Prof. Dew. I have an official statement, but
I cannot give it here as it exceeds that estimate.
In 1840 the land was 3,231,311 acres, and the
population was 790,810, and the value of the
land, real and personal, at \$354,454, and
the value of the stock."

are liberally valued at \$8 an acre, making
\$64,000,000 for the value of the lands
that now contribute to the support and
comfort of the population. But as the
waste lands contribute a little in the way
of pasturage, we put the value of the pro-
ductive lands at \$70,000,000. To this
add the value of town lots and houses—
say 30,000,000, and we have a cash val-
uation of the productive real estate amount-
ing to \$100,000,000.

The wealth of Virginia is known to con-
sist mainly in land and slaves. But what
shall we say of the slaves as an element of
wealth? How much richer are the citi-
zens of Virginia by means of their slaves
than they would be with an equal popula-
tion of free white laborers in their stead?
Experience and observation tell us that
they are no richer, but poorer. Yet for the
reasons before mentioned, the slaves are
valued at a large sum. They are a mar-
ketable commodity—a chief staple of ex-
portation. Richmond is now the greatest
slave-market in the world; and half the
State is a sort of general shambles, in
which this human live stock is currently
bought and sold, both for domestic use and
for export. We must, therefore, consider
the slaves of Virginia as constituting a
part of her available wealth, though it must
be admitted that she would be wealthier
and happier, and ere long twice as popu-
lar, if she had not a slave within her
bonds. As breeders for exportation, if
not as laborers, the slaves of Virginia con-
tribute to the wealth of their masters. We
will, therefore, value the whole stock of
Virginia 450,000, at \$200 dollars a head,
including all ages, sexes and qualities,
which will make the large sum of \$90,-
000,000. This estimate is too high, we
know; but we will let it pass. It agrees
with Mr. Fisher's, if the 400,000 slaves,
printed in the note before quoted, be, as
we suppose, a misprint for 100,000 slaves,
at which he values the 252,000 slaves—
this being an average of nearly \$400,
which is rather above the average price of
healthy middle-aged slaves. Those not
taxed are a charge, and no small one, upon
their masters. Therefore \$90,000,000 is a
liberal allowance for the slaves of Virginia.

It is impossible to make an accurate esti-
mate of the personal property of the State.
But as the object is to compare the wealth
of Virginia with that of New York, we
have in the New York assessment a crit-
erion to which Mr. Fisher cannot object,
for he uses that assessment in his calcu-
lation. In that assessment the real estate is
valued at five hundred and nine and a half
millions, and the personal estate at one
hundred and twenty-one millions, consid-
erably less than one-fourth of the real es-
tate. At this rate, the personal estate in
Virginia would be less than one-fourth of
one hundred millions, but let it be twenty-
five millions.

If this be thought too little, because it
allows to each free inhabitant an average
personal property of only thirty-one and a
half dollars, including poor folks, free ne-
groes and children, we admit that it is ap-
parently less than the truth, but not very
much less for the class of poor white folks
and free negroes is very large, and many of
them are not worth five dollars a head.—
But, on the other hand, we are confident
that the New York assessment of personal
property is equally defective. Let us remem-
ber that the inhabitants of New York city
own an immense amount of movable wealth,
including horse-furniture, carriages, horses,
ships, boats, machines, materials of manu-
facture, goods, wares and merchandise,
money, bank stocks, and other stocks, &c.,
&c., &c.—and that the State contains sev-
eral other cities, such as Albany, Roch-
ester, Buffalo, Troy, Hudson, Schenectady,
&c., &c.—larger and wealthier than Vir-
ginia cities; and that New York possesses
in her canals and railroads, a fund of wealth,
probably equal in value to all the personal
estate in Virginia, for her grand canal alone
yields the State a clear revenue of \$1,500,-
000 above the interest of the canal debt.
This proves that the assessment of personal
property in New York included only cer-
tain kinds, subject to taxation, or else that
the valuation was far below the truth.

Having discussed our data, let us now
calculate the results.
Value of property in Virginia exclusive
of waste, unproductive lands, viz: real es-
tate, 100,000,000; slaves, 90,000,000; per-
sonal property, rated proportionally to
that of New York, 25,000,000—total
215,000,000, which, divided by the popu-
lation in 1840, 1,240,000, gives \$173 a
head. The New York assessment gives,
by Mr. Fisher's calculation, \$250 a head
for the average wealth of the New York-
ers.

If, like Mr. Fisher, we improperly omit
the slaves of Virginia as population, while
we add them as property, the result will be
an average slightly over that of New York.
Instead of Mr. Fisher's absurd \$759 a
head. But this way of making property,
but not persons, of the slaves, is inadmis-
sible, as we have shown.

Mr. Fisher endeavors to bolster up his
extravagant calculation of Virginia wealth,
by reference to the census returns of annual
products. Hence, in a slave-holding com-
munity there is an almost universal system
of secret plunder carried on by the slaves; nor
is there any way of preventing it. It is in
every department of the house, from the
kitchen to the parlor, from the cellar to the
garret. It infests the dairy, the pantry, the
hen-coop, the corn-crib, the potato-patch—
like the rat it creeps into holes—like the
wolf it attacks the flock—like the blight it
destroys the ripening crop.

To the credit of the poor slaves—espe-
cially the house servants, be it spoken,
many of those who are kindly treated, and
supplied with a reasonable share of com-
fort, are strictly honest. But neverthe-
less, the whole land in which slavery ex-
ists is infested with thieves in a much
higher degree than the free States generally.
Some base white folks take advantage of
the thieving propensity of the slave and set
them to stealing for their benefit.
It is any wonder, then, that Virginia,
which produces in the aggregate a great
quantity of animals, and grain, and tobacco,
makes a scarcely perceptible progress in
wealth and population, while the free States
that make less show of agricultural prod-
ucts are still thriving by industry and
economy?

makes the average product of industry in
all branches \$62 a head in Virginia, and
\$79 a head in New York.

We have heretofore, with a view to this
same inquiry, respecting the average prod-
uct of labor, carefully examined the cen-
sus tables, and Mr. Tucker's valuations,
especially in reference to agricultural prod-
ucts, and we say with confidence, that
Mr. Tucker made too high an estimate of
the value of agricultural products in Vir-
ginia. He made no allowance for an enor-
mous blunder in the returns of hemp and
flax raised in Virginia, by which her agri-
cultural products were over-rated to the value
of about a million and a half of dollars in
a single item; and he set too high a value
on several important articles of produce, es-
pecially in West Virginia.

But it would be tedious—as it certainly
is unnecessary at present—to discuss this
matter particularly. Mr. Fisher has given
no proof, authority or explanation of his
statements. We deny their correctness.
Let him attempt to prove them, and we
shall, if Providence permit, have something
more to say on the subject.

But we must notice how glibly he makes
the following assertion: "It is clear that
after deducting the annual consumption
of both States, [as if he knew, and had
made known, what that consumption
amounted to,] Virginia will have a larger
proportional surplus remaining to augment
the stock of her permanent property." As
this is a bare assertion, we might be
content to call it so, and pass on. But it
affords us occasion to make some remarks
on the different habits of consumption in
the North and the South.

It is well known that the people of the
slave-holding States are habitually more
profligate and wasteful in the consumption of
products than the people of the free States.
Slavery generates everywhere the habits of
indolence, negligence and carelessness,
which cause frequent loss and constant
waste. He that consumes that which he
has not labored for, is naturally profligate
and wasteful. He that depends on his own
labor for supplies will take care of what he
makes, and consume it economically, be-
cause he must replace by the sweat of
his brow that which is lost or wasted.
Hence, in free States, though some do not
labor with their hands, yet the necessity of
economy and carefulness which presses on
the laboring classes, diffuses through all
classes of society more or less of the same
habits. On the contrary, in a society
where the slave-holding class consume at
pleasure the fruits which the servile class
labor for, and the servile class have little or
no interest in the fruits of their labor, both
from the operation of contrary causes, fall
into habits of wasteful consumption; the
master because he does not feel what it
costs to produce, the slave because he does
not save his labor by care and economy.—
Even the poor white folks in a slave-hold-
ing community fall into improvident and
wasteful habits by imitation, by ignorance,
and by abjection.

Of course all general observations of
this sort are to be understood with excep-
tions. There are careful and economical
individuals in a slave-holding society, as
there are spendthrifts and wasters in a free
State. We speak of what is general, not
of what is universal, in differently con-
stituted societies—of tendencies, not of uni-
form effects.

Hence we cannot judge correctly of the
progress of wealth in a State, from the
average products of labor, without compar-
ing these with the prevalent habits of consump-
tion. What is true of individuals, is true
also, of communities in this respect. If
farmer A. makes 5,000 bushels of grain
yearly, and farmer B. 4,000, it does not fol-
low that farmer A. is growing rich faster
than farmer B., nor that he lives more com-
fortably. Even if they make these different
crops at the same expense of labor, still
farmer A., by wasteful consumption and
losses by negligence, may sell less and en-
joy less of his crop than farmer B. sells
and enjoys out of his by care and econ-
omy. The same principles apply to the
production, as well as to the consumption
of crops. Indolent farmer A., with his
horse of slaves, may raise 5,000 bushels,
but his family and his slaves may in the
meanwhile have consumed and wasted 3,000;
while farmer B., who raises 4,000, may
have done it at an expense of only 1,500
bushels.

Another circumstance of importance,
though well known in the slave States,
is seldom noticed in arguing upon the econ-
omy of slave labor; and that is, the prac-
tice, so general among slaves, of "picking
and stealing, first from their masters, on the
principle that they work for more than
their masters allow them, and that they
may rightfully help themselves; and sec-
ondly, from the white people generally, on
the principle that the black people are
wronged and oppressed by the white peo-
ple as a class, and may, therefore, justly in-
demnify themselves out of the property of
those who do not allow them the right to
have property—not even in their own flesh
and bones. Such is slave morality. Of
course we disapprove of it; but we cannot
beat it out of the understandings of the
slaves. Hence, in a slave-holding com-
munity there is an almost universal system
of secret plunder carried on by the slaves; nor
is there any way of preventing it. It is in
every department of the house, from the
kitchen to the parlor, from the cellar to the
garret. It infests the dairy, the pantry, the
hen-coop, the corn-crib, the potato-patch—
like the rat it creeps into holes—like the
wolf it attacks the flock—like the blight it
destroys the ripening crop.

To the credit of the poor slaves—espe-
cially the house servants, be it spoken,
many of those who are kindly treated, and
supplied with a reasonable share of com-
fort, are strictly honest. But neverthe-
less, the whole land in which slavery ex-
ists is infested with thieves in a much
higher degree than the free States generally.
Some base white folks take advantage of
the thieving propensity of the slave and set
them to stealing for their benefit.

It is any wonder, then, that Virginia,
which produces in the aggregate a great
quantity of animals, and grain, and tobacco,
makes a scarcely perceptible progress in
wealth and population, while the free States
that make less show of agricultural prod-
ucts are still thriving by industry and
economy?

prosperous as Mr. Fisher pretends, emigra-
tion from her boundaries would cease; for
why then should her people fly to other
countries? Where could the members of
"the richest community in the world" (as
Mr. F. calls them)—where could they bet-
ter their condition? And why (for it is a
fact) should lands in most parts of old
Virginia be constantly declining in value?
But enough. It is useless to batter the
dead body of an argument that never had
animation enough to make it stand erect.
Finally, he compares Ohio and Kentucky
in point of wealth, and here he pursues
the same method of comparison. Here he
finds State assessments of taxable property,
and applies them without enquiring how,
or on what principles they were made;
whether they include the same or different
species of property; whether the same spe-
cies of property was valued upon the same
method or different principle in the two
States; at half their market prices, as in
some States, or at their full value, as in
others; whether land, for example, is val-
ued piece by piece, without reference to a
classification of qualities, or whether each
piece is referred to one of a few classes of
qualities, and valued at an arbitrary price
assigned to that quality, though it may be
worth twice as much as other pieces in-
cluded in the same class.

These different methods are pursued in
different States. Hence, without an analy-
sis of these assessments, no safe conclusion
can be founded on them, concerning the
aggregate wealth of a State. They are
designed only to determine what propor-
tion of the taxes each holder of taxable
property shall pay, and this can be deter-
mined as well when the property is assessed
at half its market value, as when it is rated
at its whole value. Mr. Fisher pays no at-
tention to these considerations. Finding
that the assessed value in two States suits
the purpose of his argument, he looks no
further; he falls to calculating straightway.
Putting in the slaves as property, and taking
them out as population, he gives the slave
State the double advantage of this ingenu-
ous device; and finding by long division
that the freemen of the slave State have a
greater average share of assessed values
than the capitalists and the laborers of the
free States have, he concludes at once that
the slave State is wealthier. There is no
more to be said or argued on the subject,
except to close, like the geometrician, with
"Quod erat demonstrandum"—that is what
I had to demonstrate. It is done.

But the variation of the assessments in re-
gard to the species of property assessed,
and the principles on which its value is
rated, are not all that should engage our
attention. The object is to discover
whether slavery does or does not promote
the wealth and prosperity of States. This
cannot be determined by the simple fact
that the people of a certain slave State
have at a certain time a greater average
wealth than the people of a certain free
State; no, not even when both are Western
States. Certain historical and geographical
and social circumstances are to be taken
into consideration. The number and den-
sity of the population are also important
considerations.

Mr. Fisher's principles of reasoning on
this subject lead inevitably to the conclu-
sion that if, in a district of a thousand
square miles there be 100 white persons
holding 500 negro slaves; and in another
district of one thousand square miles there
be 50,000 free inhabitants; and if the prop-
erty in the former district, including land,
slaves and personal property be assessed at
its full value, amounting to \$100,000,
making an average of \$1000 to each
white person; and if the property of the
latter district be assessed at the half of its
full value, amounting to \$50,000, or an
average of two hundred dollars for each
inhabitant—no slaves existing there; then
it is demonstrated that the people of the
former district are exactly five times as
wealthy as those of the latter. Yet, just
five times as wealthy; and though the two
districts were equal in soil, in age of settle-
ment, and every circumstance that could
equalize the means of prosperity in the
two, and therefore—(here comes the gist
of the argument)—therefore slavery is adapted
to produce five times as much wealth and
happiness as free labor. Can Mr. Fisher
refuse to go this length without departing
from his principles of argument?

Now let us consider those circumstances
before alluded to, which ought to modify
any inference which might be drawn from
the average wealth of the free people in the
two States of Ohio and Kentucky.
With the exception of Louisiana, there is
not in the Union a slave-holding State that
ought, in proportion to its size, to possess so
much wealth as the State of Kentucky.
The wonderful fertility and beauty of the
one-half of this State, drew into it, from 40
to 60 years ago, a large emigration of
wealthy slave-holders from Virginia and
Maryland. If anywhere slavery can be
profitably used, it is in the opening and
cultivation of a new soil of such exuber-
ant richness. Here, then, was an early
and most advantageous opportunity for ac-
cumulating a high degree of wealth in the
hands of slave-holders; so as to produce a
large average when the white people only
were taken into the account. This aver-
age has been raised by the effect of slavery
upon the movement of the population.
The rich lands of the interior have been
gradually monopolized by slave-holders,
and the poorer class of white people driven
off, as in old Virginia, to other coun-
tries. It is only the poorer lands on
which many poor white people are now to
be found, while as yet slavery has not had
time to produce its most deleterious effects
on the country. Here, then, the slave-hold-
ing system is just in its most advantageous
position to show a large average of wealth
among the white inhabitants of at least the
populous parts of the State.

Now let us look at Ohio. Its settlement
did not fairly begin until Kentucky was al-
ready considerably wealthy and populous.
Slavery being prohibited, no wealthy slave-
holders could settle there with their pecu-
liar sort of property, to exclude white men,
and swell the assessments by valuing the black
population at so much a head. Ohio was
the poor white man's place of refuge. Few
of the emigrants possessed much more cap-
ital than would pay for their land, many
not so much as that. Such emigrants, be-
ginning 20 or 30 years later than the Ken-
tuckians, have not had half the time and

means of the Kentuckians to accumulate
property. Within the last 30 years great
numbers of poor laborers have flocked to
that State for employment. What has
been the consequence? An increase of
population beyond all precedent—a growth
of improvement, of wealth, and a general
prosperity never before resulted in a similar
case. In little more than half the time,
the aggregate wealth of Ohio has grown
from almost nothing to a value twice as
great as that of Kentucky, slaves excepted.
We speak according to the assessments, be
they right or wrong. True, the average
wealth of the population is much inferior to
that of the free Kentuckians. How, in such
circumstances, could it have been otherwise?
But let us consider what a vast amount of
aggregate wealth the people of Ohio have
created within 30 years, beginning
with an average capital exceedingly small;
and at what a rate they are now going on to
accumulate! The growing demand for labor
there is evinced by the continued influx of
poor industrious men. This checks the in-
crease of average wealth, but it accelerates
the increase of aggregate wealth. No where
on earth, perhaps, in so large a community,
is there so rapid a development of all the
elements of a prosperous and refined civi-
lization as in Ohio. Her people, hastily
gathered from half the nations of Europe,
and half the States of the Union, form as
yet a crude mass, fermenting like new
wine. With much original impurity, soci-
ety is working itself clear; the young
population is nearly all at school; and
when it comes forth to act its part, what
slave-holding community on earth can show
such glorious results of slavery as Ohio
will then show of what man can do under
the beneficent influences of universal lib-
erty, universal education, and universal
industry?

We are getting on slowly with Mr.
Fisher. We have reviewed but six pages
of the thirty-six in his pamphlet. But let
not the reader be alarmed lest we should
continue at this slow rate. These six pages
contain the foundation of his argument.
All the rest is superstructure, some of it so
light and flimsy that we shall not need
even to touch it. We thought it best to
tear up his foundation thoroughly and effec-
tually. Then the superstructure would fall
of itself. Where it has some appearance of
solidity, we shall give it a slight push, suf-
ficient to make it fall in pieces. We wish,
as we go along, not merely to refute, but to
present facts and principles, which, besides
removing the errors of Mr. Fisher, shall
furnish the reader with the means of form-
ing a right decision on the great question
now under discussion in Kentucky.

If we have heretofore occupied much
more space in refuting than Mr. Fisher
occupied in presenting his erroneous argu-
ments, let it be considered that a booby can
in five minutes so tangle a hank of yarn
that a philosopher could hardly disentangle
it in a day; much more, then, can such a
genius as Mr. Fisher so derange and misap-
ply a few facts and principles, that such
plodders as we are must take nearly a page
to set half-a-dozen lines to rights. But let
us proceed.

On page 7 he attempts to justify his
method of considering slaves merely as
property, like hogs and mules—adding
their estimated value to the wealth, deduct-
ing their number from the population, and
then calculating the wealth of a State upon
the basis of its free population only. We
have said enough heretofore to expose this
statistical trickery, so we shall leave his
flimsy justification to fall by its own ab-
surdity. But in the following sentence he
tells such a rousing fib, that we must quote
and contradict him. He says: "The
Southern States are still wealthier than the
Northern, counting the slaves as persons,
and leaving them out as property."

Now this is an assertion which he has
not proved, and cannot prove, and cannot
render even plausible to the most superficial
reader, without falsifying facts, and contra-
dicting the plainest evidence, both direct
and circumstantial—and what is more, con-
tradicting himself, where, in his zeal for
the cause of slavery, he most inconsistently
attributes to the trifling policy the ruin of
Southern commerce and manufactures; and
looking on the desolation of Southern
cities, re-echoes from afar the obsolete
howl of the South Carolina wolves of nul-
lification.

On page 8 he says: "The triumph of
Southern enterprise and capital in the ac-
cumulation of wealth being established as a
fact—demands an investigation of its causes."
This is quite philosophical. First make
sure of your fact; then search for the why
and the wherefore. But what if the fact be
not established; if the triumph of southern
enterprise and capital be in fact a defeat?
What then? Still we must search for the
causes. This we intend to do; and more-
over, we shall show that Mr. Fisher's as-
signed causes of the supposed triumph, are
the very causes of the actual defeat. But
before we follow his investigation of causes,
we shall give additional evidence that the
shot of triumph is premature.

We shall not be so unreasonable as to
conclude from two or three assessments of
taxable property, that the south is on the
whole either more or less wealthy than the
north. We shall take the best evidence
that can be had, which is the returns of the
last census. These, though of course lia-
ble to some error, are not liable to the ma-
terial objection that we have shown to lie
against State assessments, as evidence of
comparative wealth. The census had no
reference to taxation, and presented little
temptation to falsify in answering questions
about the products of industry. It had ref-
erence to precisely the same matters, and
was conducted on the same principles, in
all the States. Obviously, therefore, it is
far more reliable evidence of comparative
wealth, than State assessments, and the
false conjectures, estimates, on which Mr.
Fisher relies in making out the wealth of
Virginia and Massachusetts.

The census furnished returns of animal
products and live stock in the department
of Agriculture; of annual products and cap-
ital in the department of Manufactures and
mechanical trades; and of capital invested
in Commerce. Still it omitted to furnish
information respecting the value of land,
the amount of capital invested in roads and
canals, and the profits derived from it, and
the amount of other stocks and moneyed
capital in the several States. As the free

States are known to have a great superior-
ity in all these particulars, it is evident that
any estimate of comparative wealth, deduc-
ed from the census alone, will present the
south in too favorable a light. Let this be
borne in mind.

Professor Tucker, late of the University
of Virginia, in his work on the "Progress of
Population," &c., gives a calculation based
on the census, of the value of all the pro-
ducts of industry in the year 1839. We
have already alluded to this. He aimed at
impartiality; but after a careful examination
made two years ago, we think that he
erred in favor of the south. But let that
pass. We will give the results of his cal-
culation. After estimating the total value
of products in each State, he divided that
sum by the population, and thus found the
average value per head, of the products of
industry for one year. He was not so blind-
ed by admiration of slavery, as to include
in his calculation all the free-laborers of the
north, while he excluded the slave-laborers
of the south. Therefore, his calculations,
so far as they are correctly made, exhibit
the comparative productiveness of labor in
the free and slaveholding States.

The following tables present the results
of his calculations:

TABLE I.
Showing the total value of the Products of Labor
in the Year 1839, and the Average Value per
head of the Population, in Seventeen States:

STATES.	Popu- lation in 1840.	Total Value of Products.	Average Value per head.
Maine, - - -	501,800	\$26,463,000	\$52
New Hampshire, - - -	284,500	19,526,000	68
Vermont, - - -	291,900	25,143,000	85
Massachusetts, - - -	737,700	75,470,000	103
Rhode Island, - - -	108,800	13,001,000	120
Connecticut, - - -	310,000	28,924,000	90
New England, - - -	2,334,800	\$187,627,000	\$84
New York, - - -	2,425,900	\$193,806,000	\$79
New Jersey, - - -	373,500	29,672,000	79
Pennsylvania, - - -	1,734,000	131,034,000	76
Middle States, - - -	4,526,200	\$354,512,000	\$78
Virginia, - - -	1,239,800	\$76,709,000	\$62
N. Carolina, - - -	753,400	\$2,422,000	44
S. Carolina, - - -	594,400	27,174,000	45
Georgia, - - -	691,400	35,080,000	52
Southern States, - - -	3,079,000	\$171,385,000	\$52
Tennessee, - - -	829,200	37,373,000	\$45
Kentucky, - - -	1,719,800	38,624,000	49
Ohio, - - -	779,500	63,907,000	42
Indiana, - - -	685,300	25,533,000	34

TABLE II.
Showing the total value of the Agricultural Pro-
ducts of the same States in 1839, and the aver-
age product of each person engaged in Agricul-
ture:

STATES.	Persons engaged in Agricul- ture.	Value of Ag- ricultural Pro- ducts.	Average value per person.
Maine, - - -	101,630	\$15,856,000	\$156
New Hampshire, - - -	77,949	11,378,000	146
Vermont, - - -	73,150	17,879,000	245
Massachusetts, - - -	87,827	16,065,000	183
Rhode Island, - - -	16,617	2,199,000	132
Connecticut, - - -	50,518	11,372,000	225
New England, - - -	407,701	\$74,750,000	\$183
New York, - - -	455,954	\$108,275,000	\$238
New Jersey, - - -	56,701	16,210,000	286
Pennsylvania, - - -	307,533	68,151,000	\$222
Middle States, - - -	720,178	\$192,966,000	\$268
Virginia, - - -	318,771	\$59,086,000	\$185
N. Carolina, - - -	217,095	26,976,000	124
S. Carolina, - - -	198,363	21,554,000	108
Georgia, - - -	309,283	31,468,000	101
Southern States, - - -	943,612	\$139,054,000	\$147
Tennessee, - - -	227,739	\$31,681,000	\$139
Kentucky, - - -	193,728	29,227,000	151
Ohio, - - -	372,576	37,802,000	\$101
Indiana, - - -	248,809	17,248,000	69